

ON THE PICARD NUMBER OF FANO 6-FOLDS WITH A NON-SMALL CONTRACTION

TAKU SUZUKI

ABSTRACT. A generalization of S. Mukai's conjecture says that if X is a Fano n -fold with Picard number ρ_X and pseudo-index i_X , then $\rho_X(i_X - 1) \leq n$, with equality if and only if $X \cong (\mathbb{P}^{i_X-1})^{\rho_X}$. In this paper, we prove that this conjecture holds if $n = 6$ and either X admits a contraction of fiber type or X admits no small contractions.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider Fano manifolds, i.e., smooth complex projective varieties with ample anti-canonical line bundle. In 1988, S. Mukai proposed the following conjecture:

Conjecture 1.1 ([9]). *Let X be a Fano n -fold with Picard number ρ_X and index r_X (see Definition 3.1). Then $\rho_X(r_X - 1) \leq n$, with equality if and only if $X \cong (\mathbb{P}^{r_X-1})^{\rho_X}$.*

Conjecture 1.1 for $r_X \geq n + 1$ corresponds to a characterization of projective spaces by S. Kobayashi and T. Ochiai ([6]).

L. Bonavero, C. Casagrande, O. Debarre, and S. Druel proposed the following more general conjecture:

Conjecture 1.2 ([2]). *Let X be a Fano n -fold with Picard number ρ_X and pseudo-index i_X (see Definition 3.2). Then $\rho_X(i_X - 1) \leq n$, with equality if and only if $X \cong (\mathbb{P}^{i_X-1})^{\rho_X}$.*

Conjecture 1.2 for $i_X \geq n + 1$ corresponds to a characterization of projective spaces by K. Cho, Y. Miyaoka, and N. I. Shepherd-Barron ([5]). Conjecture 1.2 has been investigated by many authors, and it has been proved in the following cases:

- In 2003, by L. Bonavero, C. Casagrande, O. Debarre, and S. Druel ([2]),
 - $n \leq 4$,
 - X is homogeneous,
 - X is toric and either $i_X \geq \frac{n+3}{3}$ or $n \leq 7$.
- In 2004, by M. Andreatta, E. Chierici, and G. Occhetta ([1]),
 - $n = 5$,
 - $i_X \geq \frac{n+3}{3}$ and X admits an unsplit dominating family of rational curves (see Definition 2.4).
- In 2006, by C. Casagrande ([3]),
 - X is toric.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14J45, 14E30.

Key words and phrases. Mukai's Conjecture; Fano manifolds; Picard number; pseudo-index; rational curves.

- In 2010, by C. Novelli and G. Occhetta ([11]),
– $i_X \geq \frac{n+3}{3}$.
- In 2012, by C. Novelli ([10]),
– $i_X = \frac{n+1}{3}, \frac{n+2}{3}$,
– $i_X = \frac{n}{3}$ and X admits an unsplit dominating family of rational curves.

By [11] and [10], we know that Conjecture 1.2 for $n = 6$ is true if either $i_X \geq 3$ or X admits an unsplit dominating family of rational curves. In this paper, we consider Fano 6-folds which admit no unsplit dominating families of rational curves, and we prove the following theorem:

Theorem 1.3. *Let X be a Fano 6-fold with Picard number ρ_X and pseudo-index $i_X \geq 2$. Assume that X admits no unsplit dominating families of rational curves.*

- (1) *If X admits a contraction of fiber type, then $\rho_X \leq 2$ holds.*
- (2) *If X admits no small contractions, then $\rho_X \leq 4$ holds.*

In particular, Conjecture 1.2 for $n = 6$ is true if either X admits a contraction of fiber type or X admits no small contractions.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to express his gratitude to his supervisor Professor Hajime Kaji for valuable discussions. The author would also like to thank Professor Yasunari Nagai and Professor Kazunori Yasutake for beneficial comments. The author is supported by Grant-in-Aid for Research Activity Start-up from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

2. FAMILIES OF RATIONAL CURVES

Throughout this section, we consider a smooth complex projective manifold X .

Definition 2.1. We denote by $\text{RatCurves}^n(X)$ the normalization of the scheme of rational curves on X (see [7, II.2]). A *family of rational curves* on X is an irreducible component of $\text{RatCurves}^n(X)$. Given a rational curve C on X , we define a *family of deformations* of C to be a family of rational curves containing C .

Definition 2.2. Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a family of rational curves. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be the universal family of $\mathcal{V}$, and let $p : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ and $q : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow X$ be the associated morphisms. $q(\mathcal{U})$ is denoted by $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{V})$. We say that $\mathcal{V}$ is *dominating* if $\overline{\text{Locus}(\mathcal{V})} = X$.

For a subvariety $Y \subset X$, $p(q^{-1}(Y))$ (the subscheme of $\mathcal{V}$ which parametrizes curves intersecting Y) is denoted by $\mathcal{V}_Y$, and $q(p^{-1}(\mathcal{V}_Y))$ is denoted by $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{V}; Y)$. In particular, when Y is a point, $\mathcal{V}_{\{x\}}$ (resp. $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{V}; \{x\})$) is also denoted by $\mathcal{V}_x$ (resp. $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{V}; x)$).

For families $\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_m$ of rational curves, we inductively define

$$\text{Locus}(\mathcal{V}_m, \dots, \mathcal{V}_1; Y) := \text{Locus}(\mathcal{V}_m; \text{Locus}(\mathcal{V}_{m-1}, \dots, \mathcal{V}_1; Y)).$$

When $\mathcal{V}_1 = \dots = \mathcal{V}_m = \mathcal{V}$, we denote it by

$$\text{Locus}_m(\mathcal{V}; Y) := \text{Locus}(\underbrace{\mathcal{V}, \dots, \mathcal{V}}_m; Y).$$

Definition 2.3. For a family $\mathcal{V}$ of rational curves, we denote by $\overline{\mathcal{V}}$ the closure of $\mathcal{V}$ in $\text{Chow}(X)$. Note that $\overline{\mathcal{V}}$ parametrizes connected 1-cycles whose every component is a rational curve. We similarly define $\text{Locus}(\overline{\mathcal{V}})$, $\overline{\mathcal{V}}_Y$, $\text{Locus}(\overline{\mathcal{V}}; Y)$, $\text{Locus}(\overline{\mathcal{V}}_m, \dots, \overline{\mathcal{V}}_1; Y)$, and $\text{Locus}_m(\overline{\mathcal{V}}; Y)$.

Definition 2.4. Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a family of rational curves.

- (1) $\mathcal{V}$ is said to be *unsplit* if it is proper (i.e., $\overline{\mathcal{V}} = \mathcal{V}$ as sets).
- (2) For a closed subvariety $Y \subset X$ intersecting $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{V})$ (resp. a point $x \in \text{Locus}(\mathcal{V})$), $\mathcal{V}$ is said to be *unsplit on Y* (resp. *unsplit at x*) if $\mathcal{V}_Y$ (resp. $\mathcal{V}_x$) is proper.
- (3) $\mathcal{V}$ is said to be *locally unsplit* if $\mathcal{V}$ is unsplit at a general point of $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{V})$.
- (4) $\mathcal{V}$ is said to be *quasi-unsplit* if every component of any cycle parametrized by $\overline{\mathcal{V}}$ is numerically proportional to $\mathcal{V}$.

Definition 2.5. Let $\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_m$ be families of rational curves. We define a *connected chain parametrized by $(\overline{\mathcal{V}}_1, \dots, \overline{\mathcal{V}}_m)$* as a chain $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i=1}^m$ such that each Γ_i is a cycle parametrized by $\overline{\mathcal{V}}_i$ and $\Gamma_i \cap \Gamma_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$. We say that two subvarieties $Y, Z \subset X$ can be *connected by $(\overline{\mathcal{V}}_1, \dots, \overline{\mathcal{V}}_m)$* if there exists a connected chain $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i=1}^m$ parametrized by $(\overline{\mathcal{V}}_1, \dots, \overline{\mathcal{V}}_m)$ such that $Y \cap \Gamma_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $\Gamma_m \cap Z \neq \emptyset$.

Definition 2.6. Let $\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_k$ be families of rational curves. We say that two points $x, y \in X$ are in *m -rc($\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_k$)-relation* if they can be connected by $(\overline{\mathcal{V}}_{i(1)}, \dots, \overline{\mathcal{V}}_{i(m)})$ for some $1 \leq i(j) \leq k$. We say that x and y are in *rc($\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_k$)-relation* if they are in m -rc($\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_k$)-relation for some m . It is known ([7, IV Theorem 4.16]) that there exists an open subvariety $U \subset X$, a proper surjective morphism $\pi : U \rightarrow Z$ with connected fibers, and an integer $m \leq 2^{\dim X - \dim Z} - 1$ such that

- (i) the rc($\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_k$)-relation restricts to an equivalence relation on U ,
- (ii) for every $z \in Z$, $\pi^{-1}(z)$ coincides with an equivalence class for the rc($\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_k$)-relation,
- (iii) for every $z \in Z$, any two points of $\pi^{-1}(z)$ are in m -rc($\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_k$)-relation.

We call the morphism π the *rc($\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_k$)-fibration*. If Z is a point, then we say that X is *rc($\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_k$)-connected*.

Definition 2.7. We denote by $N_1(X)$ the $\mathbb{R}$ -vector space of 1-cycles with real coefficients modulo numerical equivalence. The Picard number ρ_X is the dimension of the $\mathbb{R}$ -vector space $N_1(X)$. For a subvariety $Y \subset X$, we denote by $N_1(Y, X)$ (resp. $NE(Y, X)$) the vector space (resp. cone) in $N_1(X)$ which is generated by numerical classes of curves contained in Y .

For a family $\mathcal{V}$ of rational curves, we denote by $[\mathcal{V}]$ the numerical class of a curve of $\mathcal{V}$, and by $D \cdot \mathcal{V}$ the intersection number of a divisor D and a curve of $\mathcal{V}$.

Lemma 2.8 (see [1, Lemmas 4.1 and 5.1] and [12, Lemmas 3.2]). *Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a family of rational curves, $Y \subset X$ a closed subvariety, and C a curve contained in $\text{Locus}(\overline{\mathcal{V}}; Y)$. Then we can write*

$$[C] = a[C_Y] + \sum_{i=1}^k b_i[C_i],$$

where C_Y is a curve contained in Y , each C_i is an irreducible component of a cycle parametrized by $\overline{\mathcal{V}}_Y$, and $a, b_i \in \mathbb{Q}$. Furthermore, if $\mathcal{V}$ is unsplit, then we can write

$$[C] = a[C_Y] + b[\mathcal{V}],$$

where C_Y is a curve contained in Y , $a \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$, and $b \in \mathbb{Q}$.

Lemma 2.9 (see [1, Corollary 4.4]). *Let $\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_k$ be quasi-unsplit families of rational curves. Assume that X is $\text{rc}(\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_k)$ -connected. Then $N_1(X)$ is generated by $[\mathcal{V}_1], \dots, [\mathcal{V}_k]$.*

Lemma 2.10 (see [7, IV Corollary 2.6] and [1, Lemma 5.4]). *Let $\mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_m$ be numerically independent families of rational curves. Assume that $\mathcal{V}_2, \dots, \mathcal{V}_m$ are unsplit.*

(1) *Let $x \in X$ be a point such that*

- *Locus($\mathcal{V}_m, \dots, \mathcal{V}_1; x$) is non-empty,*
- *$\mathcal{V}_1$ is unsplit at x .*

Then

$$\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{V}_m, \dots, \mathcal{V}_1; y) \geq \text{codim}_X \text{Locus}(\mathcal{V}_1) + \sum_{i=1}^m (-K_X \cdot \mathcal{V}_i) - m.$$

(2) *Assume that $\mathcal{V}_1$ is also unsplit. Let $Y \subset X$ be an irreducible closed subvariety such that*

- *Locus($\mathcal{V}_m, \dots, \mathcal{V}_1; Y$) is non-empty,*
- *$NE(Y, X) \cap (\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{V}_1] + \dots + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{V}_m]) = \{0\}$.*

Then

$$\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{V}_m, \dots, \mathcal{V}_1; Y) \geq \dim Y + \sum_{i=1}^m (-K_X \cdot \mathcal{V}_i) - m.$$

3. FANO MANIFOLDS

Throughout this section, let X be a Fano manifold (i.e., a smooth complex projective variety with ample anti-canonical line bundle $-K_X$).

Definition 3.1. We denote by r_X the greatest positive integer r such that $-K_X = rH$ for some line bundle H , which is called the *index* of X .

Definition 3.2. We denote by i_X the minimum of intersection numbers of $-K_X$ with rational curves on X , which is called the *pseudo-index* of X . Clearly $i_X \geq r_X$ holds.

Definition 3.3. Let $\pi : U \rightarrow Z$ be a proper surjective morphism mapping from an open dense subvariety $U \subset X$ to a quasi-projective variety Z . We say that a family $\mathcal{V}$ of rational curves is *horizontal dominating* with respect to π if $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{V})$ dominates Z and curves of $\mathcal{V}$ are not contracted by π . Since X is a Fano manifold, X admits such a family ([8, Theorem 2.1]). If a horizontal dominating family $\mathcal{V}$ has minimal anti-canonical degree among such families, then we call it a *minimal horizontal dominating family* with respect to π . When $\pi = \text{id}_X$, it is called a *minimal dominating family*.

Remark that a minimal horizontal dominating family with respect to π is unsplit on a general fiber of π , so it is locally unsplit. In particular, any Fano manifold X admits a locally unsplit dominating family of rational curves.

Construction 3.4 (cf. [11, Construction 1]). Suppose that X is a Fano n -fold with $i_X \geq 2$. Let $\mathcal{F}_1$ be a locally unsplit dominating family of rational curves, and $\pi_1 : X \dashrightarrow Z_1$ the $\text{rc}(\mathcal{F}_1)$ -fibration. If $\dim Z_1 > 0$, then let $\mathcal{F}_2$ be a minimal

horizontal dominating family with respect to π_1 , and $\pi_2 : X \dashrightarrow Z_2$ the $\text{rc}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2)$ -fibration, and so on. Since $\dim Z_i < \dim Z_{i-1}$, we have $\dim Z_k = 0$ for some integer k , i.e., X is $\text{rc}(\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_k)$ -connected.

Remark 3.5 (see [11, Lemma 4]). In Construction 3.4, let F_i be a general fiber of π_i . Since $\mathcal{F}_i$ is a minimal horizontal dominating family with respect to π_{i-1} , we know:

- $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_i)$ intersects F_{i-1} ,
- $\mathcal{F}_i$ is unsplit on F_{i-1} ,
- $[\mathcal{F}_i]$ does not belong to $N_1(F_{i-1}, X)$.

By applying Lemmas 2.8 and 2.10, we have:

$$\dim Z_{i-1} - \dim Z_i \geq \dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_i; y) \geq \text{codim}_X \text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_i) - K_X \cdot \mathcal{F}_i - 1,$$

where y is a general point of $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_i)$. This implies

$$n \geq \sum_{i=1}^k \{\text{codim}_X \text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_i) - K_X \cdot \mathcal{F}_i - 1\}.$$

We also have that $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_k$ are numerically independent.

Lemma 3.6. *Let X be a Fano n -fold with $i_X \geq 2$. For any unsplit family $\mathcal{V}$ of rational curves, $\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{V}) > \frac{n}{2}$ holds.*

Proof. Let d be the dimension of $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{V})$. By Lemma 2.10, for any point $y \in \text{Locus}(\mathcal{V})$, we have:

$$d \geq \dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{V}; y) \geq (n - d) + 2 - 1.$$

This implies $d > \frac{n}{2}$. □

Lemma 3.7. *Let X be a Fano manifold X with $i_X \geq 2$ which admits no unsplit dominating families of rational curves. Then, for any prime divisor $D \subset X$, we have $N_1(D, X) = N_1(X)$.*

Proof. By [4, Theorem 1.2], any Fano manifold with $i_X \geq 2$ satisfies either

- (i) $i_X = 2$ and X is a $\mathbb{P}^1$ -bundle over a Fano manifold Y with $i_Y \geq 2$, or
- (ii) $N_1(D, X) = N_1(X)$ for any prime divisor $D \subset X$.

If (i) holds, then the family of fibers is an unsplit dominating family of rational curves on X . Thus (ii) holds. □

4. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we consider Fano 6-folds X with $i_X \geq 2$ which admit no unsplit dominating families of rational curves. Note that the locus of any unsplit family of rational curves has dimension 4 or 5 by Lemma 3.6.

Proposition 4.1. *Let X be a Fano 6-fold with $i_X \geq 2$ which admits no unsplit dominating families of rational curves, and let $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_k$ be as in Construction 3.4. Then we have one of the following:*

- (a) $k = 1$,
- (b) $k = 2$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ is unsplit,
- (c) $k = 2$, $\mathcal{F}_2$ is non-unsplit, and $\rho_X = 2$.

Furthermore, in case (b), we have either

- (b1) $\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_2) = 5$, and $N_1(X) = N_1(F_1, X) + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_2]$ for a general fiber F_1 of the $\text{rc}(\mathcal{F}_1)$ -fibration π_1 , or
 (b2) $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{F}_1; x) \neq \emptyset$ for a general point $x \in X$.

Proof. Let m be the number of non-unsplit families among $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_k$. Since $\mathcal{F}_1$ is dominating (so non-unsplit), we know $m \geq 1$. If $\mathcal{F}_i$ is non-unsplit, then

$$\text{codim}_X \text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_i) - K_X \cdot \mathcal{F}_i - 1 \geq 2i_X - 1 \geq 3.$$

On the other hand, if $\mathcal{F}_i$ is unsplit, then

$$\text{codim}_X \text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_i) - K_X \cdot \mathcal{F}_i - 1 \geq 1 + i_X - 1 \geq 2.$$

By Remark 3.5, we get:

$$6 \geq 3m + 2(k - m) = 2k + m,$$

thus (k, m) is equal to one of $(1, 1)$, $(2, 1)$, or $(2, 2)$.

First, we consider the case $(k, m) = (2, 2)$ (i.e., $\mathcal{F}_2$ is non-unsplit). Let x be a general point of X , and F_1 the fiber of π_1 passing through x . Since the equality of Remark 3.5 holds, we get:

$$\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_1; x) = \dim F_1 = 3,$$

so $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_1; x) = F_1$. We also get that $\mathcal{F}_2$ is dominating, and for a general point $y \in X$,

$$\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_2; y) = \dim Z_1 = 3,$$

so $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_2; y)$ dominates Z_1 . This yields $X = \text{Locus}(\overline{\mathcal{F}_2}; F_1)$ because y is a general point of X . Recall that $\mathcal{F}_2$ is unsplit on F_1 . By Lemma 2.8, we have:

$$N_1(X) = N_1(F_1, X) + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_2] = N_1(\text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_1; x), X) + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_2] = \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_1] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_2].$$

Thus (c) holds.

Next, we consider the case $(k, m) = (2, 1)$ (i.e., $\mathcal{F}_2$ is unsplit). Let x be a general point of X , and F_1 the fiber of π_1 passing through x . If $F_1 = \text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_1; x)$, then

$$\text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_2, \mathcal{F}_1; x) = \text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_2; F_1) \neq \emptyset,$$

i.e., (b2) holds. So, we suppose $\dim F_1 > \dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_1; x)$. Then, by Remark 3.5, $4 \geq 5 - \text{codim}_X \text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_2) \geq 6 - \dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_2; y) \geq \dim F_1 > \dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_1; x) \geq 3$, where y is a general point of $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_2)$. Hence, $\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_2) = 5$ and

$$\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_2; y) = \dim Z_1 = 2,$$

so $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_2; y)$ dominates Z_1 . This yields $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_2) = \text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_2; F_1)$. By applying Lemmas 3.7 and 2.8, we obtain:

$$N_1(X) = N_1(\text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}_2), X) = N_1(F_1, X) + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}_2].$$

Thus (b1) holds. $\square$

Remark 4.2. As shown later (Proposition 4.8), we can prove $\rho_X \leq 4$ in case (b1).

Corollary 4.3 (Theorem 1.3(1)). *Let X be a Fano 6-fold with $i_X \geq 2$ which admits no unsplit dominating families of rational curves. Assume that X admits a contraction of fiber type. Then $\rho_X \leq 2$ holds.*

Proof. Let R be an extremal ray of fiber type. Then there exists a dominating family $\mathcal{F}_1$ of rational curves such that $[\mathcal{F}_1] \in R$. Suppose that $\mathcal{F}_1$ has minimal anti-canonical degree among such families. Then $\mathcal{F}_1$ is locally unsplit. Since $R = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}[\mathcal{F}_1]$ is an extremal ray, we also have that $\mathcal{F}_1$ is quasi-unsplit. Let $\mathcal{F}_2, \dots, \mathcal{F}_k$ be as in Construction 3.4. According to Proposition 4.1, we may assume either (a) $k = 1$ or (b) $k = 2$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ is unsplit. By applying Lemma 2.9, we obtain that $\rho_X = 1$ in case (a), and that $\rho_X = 2$ in case (b). $\square$

Lemma 4.4. *Let X be a Fano 6-fold with $i_X \geq 2$ which admits no unsplit dominating families of rational curves. Let $\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3$ be numerically independent unsplit families of rational curves. Set $H_i := \text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}_i)$.*

- (1) *If $\dim H_1 = 4$ and there exists a connected chain parametrized by $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3)$ (see Definition 2.5), then $\rho_X = 3$.*
- (2) *If $\dim H_1 = 5$, $\dim H_2 = 4$, $H_1 \cdot \mathcal{H}_2 > 0$, and H_2 intersects H_3 , then $\rho_X = 3$.*
- (3) *If $\dim H_1 = \dim H_2 = 5$, $H_1 \cdot \mathcal{H}_2 > 0$, and $H_2 \cdot \mathcal{H}_3 > 0$, then $\rho_X \leq 4$.*

Proof. In case (1), let $\{C_i\}_{i=1}^3$ be a connected chain parametrized by $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3)$, and take a point $y \in C_1$. Since $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}_3, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_1; y)$ is non-empty, Lemma 2.10 yields:

$$\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}_3, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_1; y) \geq 2 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 3 = 5.$$

Thus, by applying Lemmas 3.7 and 2.8, we obtain that $N_1(X)$ is generated by $[\mathcal{H}_1]$, $[\mathcal{H}_2]$, $[\mathcal{H}_3]$.

Next, we prove (2). If $N_1(H_2, X)$ is contained in $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{H}_1] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{H}_2]$ (in particular, $[\mathcal{H}_3] \notin N_1(H_2, X)$), then Lemma 2.10 implies:

$$\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}_3; H_2) \geq 4 + 2 - 1 = 5.$$

Hence, Lemmas 3.7 and 2.8 give that $N_1(X)$ is generated by $[\mathcal{H}_1]$, $[\mathcal{H}_2]$, $[\mathcal{H}_3]$.

If $N_1(H_2, X)$ is not contained in $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{H}_1] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{H}_2]$, then there exists an irreducible curve $C \subset H_2$ such that $[C]$ does not belong to $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{H}_1] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{H}_2]$. Since $H_1 \cdot \mathcal{H}_2 > 0$, for any point $y \in C$, we know that $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2; y)$ is non-empty, so

$$\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2; y) \geq 2 + 2 + 2 - 2 = 4$$

by Lemma 2.10. This implies:

$$\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2; C) = \dim \bigcup_{y \in C} \text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2; y) \geq 5.$$

Indeed, if this locus also has dimension 4, then there exists a point z of this locus such that $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_1; z)$ contains C , so $[C]$ must belong to $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{H}_1] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{H}_2]$ by Lemma 2.8. It follows from Lemmas 3.7 and 2.8 that $N_1(X)$ is generated by $[\mathcal{H}_1]$, $[\mathcal{H}_2]$, $[C]$.

Finally, we prove (3). We can exchange the role of $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_3$ in (1), so we may assume $\dim H_3 = 5$. Then $N_1(H_3, X) = N_1(X)$ by Lemma 3.7. If $\rho_X \geq 4$, then there exists an irreducible curve $C \subset H_3$ such that $[C]$ does not belong to $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{H}_1] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{H}_2] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{H}_3]$. Since $H_1 \cdot \mathcal{H}_2 > 0$ and $H_2 \cdot \mathcal{H}_3 > 0$, for any point $y \in C$, we have that $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3; y)$ is non-empty, so

$$\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3; y) \geq 1 + 2 + 2 + 2 - 3 = 4.$$

This implies:

$$\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3; C) = \dim \bigcup_{y \in C} \text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3; y) \geq 5.$$

Therefore, $N_1(X)$ is generated by $[\mathcal{H}_1]$, $[\mathcal{H}_2]$, $[\mathcal{H}_3]$, $[C]$. $\square$

Construction 4.5. Let X be a Fano n -fold. Assume that there exists a locally unsplit dominating family $\mathcal{F}$ of rational curves on X such that $-K_X \cdot \mathcal{F} < 3i_X$ (in particular, any reducible cycle parametrized by $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ has just two irreducible components). Let $\pi : X \dashrightarrow Z$ be the $\text{rc}(\mathcal{F})$ -fibration, $x \in X$ a general point, F the fiber of π passing through x , and ρ the dimension of the vector space $N_1(F, X)$. Note that

$$\text{Locus}(\overline{\mathcal{F}}; x) \subset \text{Locus}_2(\overline{\mathcal{F}}; x) \subset \cdots \subset \text{Locus}_m(\overline{\mathcal{F}}; x) = F$$

for some integer m . We take integers $1 \leq m_1 \leq \cdots \leq m_{\rho-1} < m$ and pairs of families $(\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{W}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{V}_{\rho-1}, \mathcal{W}_{\rho-1})$ as follows:

First, if $\rho \geq 2$, then let m_1 be the greatest integer such that

$$N_1(\text{Locus}_{m_1}(\overline{\mathcal{F}}; x), X) \subset \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}].$$

Since

$$N_1(\text{Locus}_{m_1+1}(\overline{\mathcal{F}}; x), X) \not\subset \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}],$$

Lemma 2.8 implies that there exists a reducible cycle $C_1 + C'_1$ parametrized by $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ such that

- x and C_1 can be connected by the m_1 -tuple $(\overline{\mathcal{F}}, \dots, \overline{\mathcal{F}})$ (see Definition 2.5),
- neither $[C_1]$ nor $[C'_1]$ belongs to $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}]$.

Let $\mathcal{V}_1$ (resp. $\mathcal{W}_1$) be a family of deformations of C_1 (resp. C'_1).

Next, if $\rho \geq 3$, then let m_2 be the greatest integer such that

$$N_1(\text{Locus}_{m_2}(\overline{\mathcal{F}}; x), X) \subset \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{V}_1].$$

Since

$$N_1(\text{Locus}_{m_2+1}(\overline{\mathcal{F}}; x), X) \not\subset \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{V}_1],$$

Lemma 2.8 gives a reducible cycle $C_2 + C'_2$ parametrized by $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ such that

- x and C_2 can be connected by the m_2 -tuple $(\overline{\mathcal{F}}, \dots, \overline{\mathcal{F}})$,
- neither $[C_2]$ nor $[C'_2]$ belongs to $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{V}_1]$.

Let $\mathcal{V}_2$ (resp. $\mathcal{W}_2$) be a family of deformations of C_2 (resp. C'_2), and so on.

Set $V_i := \text{Locus}(\mathcal{V}_i)$ and $W_i := \text{Locus}(\mathcal{W}_i)$. By construction, we know:

- (1) $V_i \cap W_i \neq \emptyset$,
- (2) $\mathcal{V}_i$ and $\mathcal{W}_i$ are unsplit,
- (3) $[\mathcal{V}_i] + [\mathcal{W}_i] = [\mathcal{F}]$,
- (4) $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_{\rho-1}$ are numerically independent,
- (5) $N_1(F, X)$ is generated by $[\mathcal{F}]$, $[\mathcal{V}_1]$, $\dots$, $[\mathcal{V}_{\rho-1}]$.

Proposition 4.6. *Let X be a Fano 6-fold with $\rho_X \geq 3$ and $i_X \geq 2$ which admits no unsplit dominating families of rational curves. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a locally unsplit dominating family of rational curves. Let $(\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{W}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{V}_{\rho-1}, \mathcal{W}_{\rho-1})$ be as in Construction 4.5. Assume that $\rho \geq 3$ and $\dim V_i = 5$ for some i . Then $\rho_X \leq 4$ holds.*

Remark 4.7. Under the assumption of Proposition 4.6, $-K_X \cdot \mathcal{F} \leq 5 < 3i_X$ holds. Indeed, if $-K_X \cdot \mathcal{F} \geq 6$, then Lemma 2.10 yields:

$$\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{F}; x) \geq 6 - 1 = 5,$$

so $N_1(X)$ must be generated by only $[\mathcal{F}]$ according to Lemmas 3.7 and 2.8.

Proof of Proposition 4.6. We use the notation of Construction 4.5. Note that $D \cdot \mathcal{F} \geq 0$ for any effective divisor D on X because $\mathcal{F}$ is a dominating family.

Case 1. $\dim V_1 = 5$.

By construction, x and V_1 can be connected by the m_1 -tuple $(\overline{\mathcal{F}}, \dots, \overline{\mathcal{F}})$. Since x is a general point of X , we may assume $x \notin V_1$. Hence, we get a rational curve $C \subset \text{Locus}_{m_1}(\overline{\mathcal{F}}; x)$ such that $V_1 \cdot C > 0$. This implies $V_1 \cdot \mathcal{F} > 0$.

Case 1.1. $\dim V_2 = 4$.

Since $[\mathcal{F}] = [\mathcal{V}_2] + [\mathcal{W}_2]$, we obtain either

- (i) $V_1 \cdot \mathcal{V}_2 > 0$ or
- (ii) $V_1 \cdot \mathcal{W}_2 > 0$.

We can apply Lemma 4.4(2) for $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3) = (\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{W}_2)$ in case (i), and Lemma 4.4(1) for $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3) = (\mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{W}_2, \mathcal{V}_1)$ in case (ii). Thus both cases gives $\rho_X = 3$.

Case 1.2. $\dim V_2 = 5$.

We know that x and V_2 can be connected by the m_2 -tuple $(\overline{\mathcal{F}}, \dots, \overline{\mathcal{F}})$. Since we may assume $x \notin V_2$, we get a rational curve $C \subset \text{Locus}_{m_2}(\overline{\mathcal{F}}; x)$ such that $V_2 \cdot C > 0$. This implies:

$$V_2 \cdot (a\mathcal{F} + b\mathcal{V}_1) > 0$$

for some numbers a and b . Since

$$V_2 \cdot \mathcal{V}_1 + V_2 \cdot \mathcal{W}_1 = V_2 \cdot \mathcal{F} \geq 0,$$

we obtain either $V_2 \cdot \mathcal{V}_1 > 0$ or $V_2 \cdot \mathcal{W}_1 > 0$.

Case 1.2.1. $V_2 \cdot \mathcal{V}_1 > 0$.

Note that $\mathcal{F}$ is unsplit at x because $\mathcal{F}$ is locally unsplit. Since $V_1 \cdot \mathcal{F} > 0$ and $V_2 \cdot \mathcal{V}_1 > 0$, we have that $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{F}; x)$ is non-empty, and Lemma 2.10 yields:

$$\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{F}; x) \geq 4 + 2 + 2 - 3 = 5.$$

It follows from Lemmas 3.7 and 2.8 that $N_1(X)$ is generated by $[\mathcal{F}]$, $[\mathcal{V}_1]$, $[\mathcal{V}_2]$.

Case 1.2.2. $V_2 \cdot \mathcal{W}_1 > 0$ and $\dim W_1 = 4$.

We obtain $\rho_X = 3$ by applying Lemma 4.4(2) for $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3) = (\mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{W}_1, \mathcal{V}_1)$.

Case 1.2.3. $V_2 \cdot \mathcal{W}_1 > 0$ and $\dim W_1 = 5$.

By construction, x and W_1 can be connected by the (m_1+1) -tuple $(\overline{\mathcal{F}}, \dots, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \mathcal{V}_1)$. Since we may assume $x \notin W_1$, we get a rational curve C such that $W_1 \cdot C > 0$ and either $[C] \in \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}]$ or $C \in \mathcal{V}_1$. This yields either

- (i) $W_1 \cdot \mathcal{F} > 0$ or
- (ii) $W_1 \cdot \mathcal{V}_1 > 0$.

If (i) holds, then we can replace $\mathcal{V}_1$ with $\mathcal{W}_1$ in the proof of Case 1.2.1, so we obtain that $N_1(X)$ is generated by $[\mathcal{F}]$, $[\mathcal{W}_1]$, $[\mathcal{V}_2]$. If (ii) holds, then we have $\rho_X \leq 4$ by applying Lemma 4.4(3) for $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3) = (\mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{W}_1, \mathcal{V}_1)$.

Case 2. $\dim V_i = 5$ for some $i \geq 2$.

We may assume $\dim V_1 = \dots = \dim V_{i-1} = 4$. By construction, x and V_i can be connected by the m_i -tuple $(\overline{\mathcal{F}}, \dots, \overline{\mathcal{F}})$. Since we may assume $x \notin V_i$, we get a rational curve $C \subset \text{Locus}_{m_i}(\overline{\mathcal{F}}; x)$ such that $V_i \cdot C > 0$. This implies:

$$V_i \cdot (a\mathcal{F} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} b_j \mathcal{V}_j) > 0$$

for some numbers a and b_j . Since

$$V_i \cdot \mathcal{V}_j + V_i \cdot \mathcal{W}_j = V_i \cdot \mathcal{F} \geq 0,$$

we obtain either

- (i) $V_i \cdot \mathcal{V}_j > 0$ or
- (ii) $V_i \cdot \mathcal{W}_j > 0$

for some $j \leq i-1$. Notice that $\dim V_j = 4$. We can use Lemma 4.4(2) for $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3) = (\mathcal{V}_i, \mathcal{V}_j, \mathcal{W}_j)$ in case (i), and Lemma 4.4(1) for $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3) = (\mathcal{V}_j, \mathcal{W}_j, \mathcal{V}_i)$ in case (ii) respectively. We thus obtain $\rho_X = 3$. $\square$

Proposition 4.8. *Let X be a Fano 6-fold and $i_X \geq 2$ which admits no unsplit dominating families of rational curves. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a locally unsplit dominating family of rational curves, $\mathcal{G}$ an unsplit family of rational curves. Assume that*

- X is $\text{rc}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ -connected,
- $\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{G}) = 5$,
- for a general fiber F of the $\text{rc}(\mathcal{F})$ -fibration, $[\mathcal{G}] \notin N_1(F, X)$ and $N_1(X) = N_1(F, X) + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{G}]$

Then $\rho_X \leq 4$ holds.

Proof. Assume by contradiction that $\rho_X \geq 5$. We consider Construction 4.5. By assumption, $\rho = \dim N_1(F, X) = \rho_X - 1 \geq 4$, so Proposition 4.6 yields that $\dim V_i = 4$ for every $1 \leq i \leq \rho - 1$.

Set $G := \text{Locus}(\mathcal{G})$. Since X is $\text{rc}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ -connected, $F = \text{Locus}_m(\overline{\mathcal{F}}; x)$ intersects G . Since x is a general point of X , we may assume $x \notin G$. This implies that there exists a rational curve $C \subset F$ such that $G \cdot C > 0$. Then $[C]$ belongs to $N_1(F, X) = \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{V}_1] + \dots + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{V}_{\rho-1}]$, so we have either

- (i) $G \cdot \mathcal{V}_i > 0$ or
- (ii) $G \cdot \mathcal{W}_i > 0$

for some $1 \leq i \leq \rho - 1$. However, we can apply Lemma 4.4(2) for $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3) = (\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{V}_i, \mathcal{W}_i)$ in case (i), and Lemma 4.4(1) for $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3) = (\mathcal{V}_i, \mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{G})$ in case (ii). Thus both cases give $\rho_X = 3$, a contradiction. $\square$

According to Propositions 4.1 and 4.8, it is sufficient to consider the cases (a) and (b2) in order to prove Theorem 1.3(2). First, we consider the case (a).

Proposition 4.9. *Let X be a Fano 6-fold with $\rho_X \geq 5$ and $i_X \geq 2$ which admits no unsplit dominating families of rational curves. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a locally unsplit dominating*

family of rational curves. Let $(\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{W}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{V}_{\rho-1}, \mathcal{W}_{\rho-1})$ be as in Construction 4.5. Assume that X is $\text{rc}(\mathcal{F})$ -connected, and also that X admits a divisorial extremal ray R . Then $R = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}[\mathcal{W}_i]$ for some $1 \leq i \leq \rho - 1$.

Proof. We use the notation of Construction 4.5. Notice that $F = X$ and $\rho = \rho_X$. By Proposition 4.6, we have $\dim V_i = 4$ for every $1 \leq i \leq \rho - 1$. We denote by E_R the exceptional divisor with respect to R .

Claim 1. $E_R \cdot \mathcal{F} = 0$.

Proof of Claim 1. We assume by contradiction that $E_R \cdot \mathcal{F} > 0$. Since R is divisorial and $\mathcal{F}$ is dominating, we have:

$$R \not\subset \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}] = (\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{V}_1]) \cap (\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{V}_2]),$$

so $R \not\subset (\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{V}_i])$ for some i ($= 1, 2$). This means that R , $[\mathcal{V}_i]$, $[\mathcal{W}_i]$ are independent. Since $[\mathcal{F}] = [\mathcal{V}_i] + [\mathcal{W}_i]$, we obtain either $E_R \cdot \mathcal{V}_i > 0$ or $E_R \cdot \mathcal{W}_i > 0$.

Case 1.1. $E_R \cdot \mathcal{W}_i > 0$.

By Construction 4.5, there exists a connected cycle $C_i + C'_i$ such that $C_i \in \mathcal{V}_i$ and $C'_i \in \mathcal{W}_i$. Since $E_R \cdot \mathcal{W}_i > 0$, we have $E_R \cap C'_i \neq \emptyset$. So, there exists a family $\mathcal{H}$ of rational curves such that $[\mathcal{H}] \in R$ and $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}) \cap C'_i \neq \emptyset$. Suppose that $\mathcal{H}$ has minimal anti-canonical degree among such families. Let y be a point of $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}) \cap C'_i$, then we see that $\mathcal{H}$ is unsplit at y .

If $\mathcal{H}$ is non-unsplit, then Lemma 2.10 yields:

$$\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{H}; y) \geq 1 + 4 + 2 - 2 = 5,$$

so Lemmas 3.7 and 2.8 imply that $N_1(X)$ is generated by $[\mathcal{H}]$ and $[\mathcal{W}_i]$, that is a contradiction. Thus $\mathcal{H}$ is unsplit.

However, $\rho_X = 3$ follows from Lemma 4.4(1) for $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3) = (\mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{V}_i, \mathcal{H})$, that is also a contradiction.

Case 1.2. $E_R \cdot \mathcal{V}_i > 0$.

By replacing $\mathcal{W}_i$ with $\mathcal{V}_i$ in Case 1.1, we get an unsplit family $\mathcal{H}$ of rational curves such that $[\mathcal{H}] \in R$ and there exists a connected chain parametrized by $(\mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{V}_i, \mathcal{H})$.

Case 1.2.1. $\dim W_i = 4$.

In this case, ρ_X must be 3 by Lemma 4.4(1) for $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3) = (\mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{V}_i, \mathcal{H})$, a contradiction.

Case 1.2.2. $\dim W_i = 5$.

By construction, x and W_i can be connected by the $(m_i + 1)$ -tuple $(\overline{\mathcal{F}}, \dots, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \mathcal{V}_i)$. Since we may assume $x \notin W_i$, we get a rational curve C such that $W_i \cdot C > 0$ and either $[C]$ belongs to $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{V}_1] + \dots + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{V}_{i-1}]$ or $C \in \mathcal{V}_i$. Since

$$W_i \cdot \mathcal{V}_j + W_i \cdot \mathcal{W}_j = W_i \cdot \mathcal{F} \geq 0,$$

we obtain one of

- (i) $W_i \cdot \mathcal{V}_j > 0$ for some $j \neq i$,
- (ii) $W_i \cdot \mathcal{W}_j > 0$ for some $j \neq i$,
- (iii) $W_i \cdot \mathcal{V}_i > 0$.

However, we can apply Lemma 4.4(2) for $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3) = (\mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{V}_j, \mathcal{W}_j)$ in case (i), Lemma 4.4(1) for $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3) = (\mathcal{V}_j, \mathcal{W}_j, \mathcal{W}_i)$ in case (ii), and Lemma 4.4(2) for $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3) = (\mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{V}_i, \mathcal{H})$ in case (iii) respectively. Therefore ρ_X must be 3, a contradiction. $\square$

Since E_R is an effective divisor, there exists a curve C such that $E_R \cdot C > 0$. Recall that $N_1(X)$ is generated by $[\mathcal{F}]$, $[\mathcal{V}_1]$, $\dots$, $[\mathcal{V}_{\rho-1}]$ and $E_R \cdot \mathcal{F} = 0$, so $E_R \cdot \mathcal{V}_i \neq 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq \rho - 1$. From now on, let i be the smallest index such that $E_R \cdot \mathcal{V}_i \neq 0$. Remark that R , $[\mathcal{V}_i]$, $[\mathcal{W}_i]$ are possibly not independent.

Claim 2. $E_R \cdot \mathcal{V}_i > 0$ and $E_R \cdot \mathcal{W}_i < 0$.

Proof of Claim 2. We assume by contradiction that $E_R \cdot \mathcal{V}_i < 0$. Then we have $V_i \subset E_R$. So, x and E_R can be connected by the m_i -tuple $(\overline{\mathcal{F}}, \dots, \overline{\mathcal{F}})$. Since we may assume $x \notin E_R$, we get a rational curve $C \subset \text{Locus}_{m_i}(\overline{\mathcal{F}}; x)$ such that $E_R \cdot C > 0$. This implies:

$$E_R \cdot (a\mathcal{F} + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} b_j \mathcal{V}_j) > 0$$

for some numbers a and b_j . This gives a contradiction because $E_R \cdot \mathcal{F} = E_R \cdot \mathcal{V}_1 = \dots = E_R \cdot \mathcal{V}_{i-1} = 0$. Consequently, we obtain $E_R \cdot \mathcal{V}_i (= -E_R \cdot \mathcal{W}_i) > 0$. $\square$

Claim 3. $[\mathcal{W}_i] \in R$.

Proof of Claim 3. We assume by contradiction that $[\mathcal{W}_i] \notin R$. Note that $W_i \subset E_R$ by Claim 2. So, there exists a family $\mathcal{H}$ of rational curves such that $[\mathcal{H}] \in R$ and $W_i \subset \text{Locus}(\mathcal{H})$. Suppose that $\mathcal{H}$ has minimal anti-canonical degree among such families. This implies that $\mathcal{H}$ is unsplit at some point of W_i . Since $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{W}_i$ are numerically independent, we see that $\mathcal{H}$ is unsplit as in Case 1.1 of Claim 1.

By Construction 4.5, there exists a point y such that $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{V}_i; y)$ is non-empty. Lemma 2.10 gives an irreducible component Y of $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{W}_i, \mathcal{V}_i; y)$ with

$$\dim Y \geq 2 + 2 + 2 - 2 = 4.$$

Then $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}; Y)$ is non-empty because $W_i \subset \text{Locus}(\mathcal{H})$. According to Lemma 2.8, if there exists a curve $C \subset Y$ such that $C \in \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{H}]$, then we can write:

$$[C] = a[\mathcal{V}_i] + b[\mathcal{W}_i] = c[\mathcal{H}] \quad (\in R)$$

for some $a \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, $b \in \mathbb{Q}$, and $c \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$. This implies $b > 0$ because $E_R \cdot \mathcal{V}_i > 0$, $E_R \cdot \mathcal{W}_i < 0$, and $E_R \cdot \mathcal{H} < 0$, so $[\mathcal{W}_i]$ must belong to the extremal ray R . Thus we have $NE(Y, X) \cap \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{H}] = \{0\}$. Hence, Lemma 2.10 yields:

$$\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}; Y) \geq 4 + 2 - 1 = 5,$$

so $N_1(X)$ must be generated by $[\mathcal{V}_i]$, $[\mathcal{W}_i]$, $[\mathcal{H}]$ according to Lemmas 3.7 and 2.8, a contradiction. $\square$

Consequently, we obtain the conclusion of Proposition 4.9. $\square$

Corollary 4.10 (Theorem 1.3(2) for the case (a)). *Let X be a Fano 6-fold with $i_X \geq 2$ which admits no unsplit dominating families of rational curves. Assume that X is $\text{rc}(\mathcal{F})$ -connected for some locally unsplit dominating family $\mathcal{F}$, and also that every extremal ray of X is divisorial. Then $\rho_X \leq 4$ holds.*

Proof. If $\rho_X \geq 5$, then Proposition 4.9 yields that $N_1(X)$ is generated by $[\mathcal{W}_1], \dots, [\mathcal{W}_{\rho-1}]$, that is a contradiction. $\square$

Finally, we consider the case (b2).

Assumption 4.11. X is a Fano 6-fold with $i_X \geq 2$ which admits no unsplit dominating families of rational curves. $\mathcal{F}$ is a locally unsplit dominating family of rational curves, and $\mathcal{G}$ is an unsplit family of rational curves such that

- $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are numerically independent,
- X is $\text{rc}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ -connected,
- $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}; x) \neq \emptyset$ for a general point $x \in X$.

Set $G := \text{Locus}(\mathcal{G})$. Remark that the last condition means $\text{Locus}(\overline{\mathcal{F}}; G) = X$.

We consider the following construction, which is an analogue of Construction 4.5.

Construction 4.12. Let X , $\mathcal{F}$, and $\mathcal{G}$ be as in Assumption 4.11. Note that $-K_X \cdot \mathcal{F} \leq 5 < 3i_X$ as in Remark 4.7. Let x a general point of X . Since X is $\text{rc}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ -connected, we can write

$$X = \text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}_m, \dots, \mathcal{H}_1; x),$$

where each $\mathcal{H}_i$ is either $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ or $\mathcal{G}$. Set

$$U_i := \bigcup_{j=1}^i \text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}_j, \dots, \mathcal{H}_1; x)$$

for $1 \leq i \leq m$, and $\rho := \rho_X$. We take integers $1 \leq m_1 \leq \dots \leq m_{\rho-2} < m$ and pairs of families $(\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{W}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{V}_{\rho-2}, \mathcal{W}_{\rho-2})$ as follows:

First, if $\rho \geq 3$, then let m_1 be the greatest integer such that

$$N_1(U_{m_1}, X) \subset \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{G}].$$

Since

$$N_1(U_{m_1+1}, X) \not\subset \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{G}],$$

Lemma 2.8 gives a reducible cycle $C_1 + C'_1$ parametrized by $\overline{\mathcal{F}} (= \mathcal{H}_{m_1+1})$ such that

- x and C_1 can be connected by $(\mathcal{H}_1, \dots, \mathcal{H}_{m_1})$,
- neither $[C_1]$ nor $[C'_1]$ belongs to $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{G}]$.

Let $\mathcal{V}_1$ (resp. $\mathcal{W}_1$) be a family of deformations of C_1 (resp. C'_1).

Next, if $\rho \geq 4$, then let m_2 be the greatest integer such that

$$N_1(U_{m_2}, X) \subset \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{G}] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{V}_1].$$

Since

$$N_1(U_{m_2+1}, X) \not\subset \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{G}] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{V}_1],$$

Lemma 2.8 gives a reducible cycle $C_2 + C'_2$ parametrized by $\overline{\mathcal{F}} (= \mathcal{H}_{m_2+1})$ such that

- x and C_2 can be connected by $(\mathcal{H}_1, \dots, \mathcal{H}_{m_2})$,
- neither $[C_2]$ nor $[C'_2]$ belongs to $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{G}] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{V}_1]$.

Let $\mathcal{V}_2$ (resp. $\mathcal{W}_2$) be a family of deformations of C_2 (resp. C'_2), and so on.

Set $V_i := \text{Locus}(\mathcal{V}_i)$ and $W_i := \text{Locus}(\mathcal{W}_i)$. By construction, we know:

- (1) $V_i \cap W_i \neq \emptyset$,
- (2) $\mathcal{V}_i$ and $\mathcal{W}_i$ are unsplit,
- (3) $[\mathcal{V}_i] + [\mathcal{W}_i] = [\mathcal{F}]$,

- (4) $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{V}_1, \dots, \mathcal{V}_{\rho-2}$ are numerically independent,
- (5) $N_1(X)$ is generated by $[\mathcal{F}], [\mathcal{G}], [\mathcal{V}_1], \dots, [\mathcal{V}_{\rho-2}]$.

Proposition 4.13. *Let X , $\mathcal{F}$, and $\mathcal{G}$ be as in Assumption 4.11, and let $(\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{W}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{V}_{\rho-2}, \mathcal{W}_{\rho-2})$ be as in Construction 4.12. Assume that $\rho_X \geq 5$ and X admits a divisorial extremal ray R . Then $R = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}[\mathcal{W}_i]$ for some $1 \leq i \leq \rho - 2$.*

Proof.

Claim 1. If there exists an unsplit family $\mathcal{H}$ of rational curves such that

- $H := \text{Locus}(\mathcal{H})$ has dimension 5,
- $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}$ are numerically independent.

Then $H \cdot \mathcal{G} = 0$ holds.

Proof of Claim 1. Let x be a general point of X . If $H \cdot \mathcal{G} \neq 0$, then $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}; x)$ is non-empty, so Lemma 2.10 gives:

$$\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}; x) \geq 4 + 2 + 2 - 3 = 5.$$

It follows from Lemmas 3.7 and 2.8 that $N_1(X)$ is generated by $[\mathcal{F}], [\mathcal{G}], [\mathcal{H}]$, a contradiction. $\square$

By Claim 1, if V_j (resp. W_j) has dimension 5 for some j , then $V_j \cdot \mathcal{G} = 0$ (resp. $W_j \cdot \mathcal{G} = 0$). This allows us to prove that

- $\dim V_i = 4$ for every $1 \leq i \leq \rho - 2$,
- $E_R \cdot \mathcal{F} = 0$,
- If $E_R \cdot \mathcal{G} = 0$, then $R = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}[\mathcal{W}_i]$ for some $1 \leq i \leq \rho - 2$,

as in the proof of Propositions 4.6 and 4.9 by replacing $(\overline{\mathcal{F}}, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \dots)$ with $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \dots)$. So we only need to show that $E_R \cdot \mathcal{G} = 0$.

Claim 2. $\dim G = 4$.

Proof of Claim 2. We assume by contradiction that $\dim G = 5$. Let x be a general point of X . The assumption $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}; x) \neq \emptyset$ means that x and G can be connected by a curve parametrized by $\mathcal{F}$. Since $x \notin G$, we have $G \cdot \mathcal{F} > 0$. This implies either

- (i) $G \cdot \mathcal{V}_1 > 0$ or
- (ii) $G \cdot \mathcal{W}_1 > 0$.

We can apply Lemma 4.4(2) for $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3) = (\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{W}_1)$ in case (i), and Lemma 4.4(1) for $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3) = (\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{W}_1, \mathcal{G})$ in case (ii) respectively. Therefore ρ_X must be 3, a contradiction. $\square$

Claim 3. $N_1(G, X)$ is contained in $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{G}]$.

Proof of Claim 3. For a general point $x \in X$, Lemma 2.10 gives:

$$\dim \text{Locus}(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F}; x) \geq 4 + 2 - 2 = 4,$$

so this locus coincides with G by Claim 2. Hence, the assertion follows from Lemma 2.8. $\square$

Claim 4. $E_R \cdot \mathcal{G} = 0$.

Proof of Claim 4. First, we assume $E_R \cdot \mathcal{G} < 0$. Then $G \subset E_R$. Since a general point $x \in X$ and G can be connected by a curve parametrized by $\mathcal{F}$, this implies $E_R \cdot \mathcal{F} > 0$, a contradiction.

Next, we assume $E_R \cdot \mathcal{G} > 0$. Since $X = \text{Locus}(\overline{\mathcal{F}}; G)$, there exists a reducible cycle $C + C'$ parametrized by $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ such that

- C intersects G ,
- neither $[C]$ nor $[C']$ belongs to $\mathbb{R}[\mathcal{F}] + \mathbb{R}[\mathcal{G}] + (\pm R)$, where $\pm R := R \cup (-R)$.

Indeed, otherwise $N_1(X)$ must be generated by $[\mathcal{F}]$, $[\mathcal{G}]$, R according to Lemma 2.8 and Claim 3. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a family of deformations of C . Notice that $\mathcal{U}$ is unsplit.

Since $E_R \cdot \mathcal{G} > 0$, E_R intersects $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{G}; C)$, so we get a family $\mathcal{H}$ of rational curves such that $[\mathcal{H}] \in R$ and $H := \text{Locus}(\mathcal{H})$ intersects $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{G}; C)$. Suppose that $\mathcal{H}$ has minimal anti-canonical degree among such families. This implies that $\mathcal{H}$ is unsplit on $\text{Locus}(\mathcal{G}; C)$. Note that $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ are numerically independent because $E_R \cdot \mathcal{G} > 0$ and $E_R \cdot \mathcal{H} < 0$. Hence, we see that $\mathcal{H}$ is unsplit as in Case 1.1 of Proposition 4.9.

If $\dim H = 4$, then $\rho_X = 3$ by Lemma 4.4(1) for $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3) = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{U})$, a contradiction. However, even if $\dim H = 5$, then $H = E_R$, so $H \cdot \mathcal{G} > 0$. This implies $\rho_X = 3$ by Lemma 4.4(2) for $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3) = (\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{U})$, also a contradiction. $\square$

Thus we obtain the conclusion of Proposition 4.13. $\square$

Corollary 4.14 (Theorem 1.3(2) for the case (b2)). *Let X , $\mathcal{F}$, and $\mathcal{G}$ be as in Assumption 4.11. Assume that every extremal ray of X is divisorial. Then $\rho_X \leq 4$ holds.*

Proof. If $\rho_X \geq 5$, then Proposition 4.13 yields that $N_1(X)$ is generated by $[\mathcal{W}_1], \dots, [\mathcal{W}_{\rho-2}]$, that is a contradiction. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Andreatta, E. Chierici, and G. Occhetta, Generalized Mukai conjecture for special Fano varieties, *Cent. Eur. J. Math.* **2**(2) (2004), 272-293.
- [2] L. Bonavero, C. Casagrande, O. Debarre, and S. Druel, Sur une conjecture de Mukai, *Comment. Math. Helv.*, **78**(3) (2003), 601-626.
- [3] C. Casagrande, The number of vertices of a Fano polytope, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, **54**(3) (2006), 363-403.
- [4] C. Casagrande, On the Picard number of divisors in Fano manifolds, *The Annales Scientifiques de l'Ecole Normale Supérieure*, **45**(3) (2012), 363-403.
- [5] K. Cho, Y. Miyaoka, and N. I. Shepherd-Barron, Characterizations of projective space and applications to complex symplectic manifolds, *Adv. Stud. Pure Math.*, **35** (2002), 1-88.
- [6] S. Kobayashi and T. Ochiai, Characterizations of complex projective spaces and hyperquadrics, *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, **13** (1973) 31-47.
- [7] J. Kollár, *Rational Curves on Algebraic Varieties*, *Ergeb. Math. Grenzgeb.*, vol. 32. Springer, Berlin (1996).
- [8] J. Kollár Y. Miyaoka, and S. Mori, Rational connectedness and boundedness of Fano manifolds, *J. Diff. Geom.*, **36** (1992), 765-779.
- [9] S. Mukai, Open problems, In: *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, Taniguchi Foundation, Katata (1988).
- [10] C. Novelli, On Fano manifolds with an unsplit dominating family of rational curves, *Kodai Math. J.*, **35**(3) (2012), 425-438.
- [11] C. Novelli and G. Occhetta, Rational curves and bounds on the Picard number of Fano manifolds, *Geom. Dedicata*, **147** (2010), 207-217.
- [12] G. Occhetta, A characterization of products of projective spaces, *Canad. Math. Bull.* **49** (2006), 270-280.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SCHOOL OF FUNDAMENTAL SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING, WASEDA
UNIVERSITY, 3-4-1 OHKUBO, SHINJUKU, TOKYO 169-8555, JAPAN
E-mail address: s.taku.1231@moegi.waseda.jp